

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

DUVALLON C. PARKER	)	CASE NO. 1:09CV2953
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	JUDGE CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO
v.	)	
	)	
TIM LALLY CHEVROLET	)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>
	)	<u>AND ORDER</u>
	)	
Defendant.	)	

Plaintiff *pro se* Duvallon C. Parker brings this action under several federal and state statutes against defendant Tim Lally Chevrolet. He alleges that he was unfairly discharged from his employment with the defendant without being paid all of his commission. He is seeking \$1,725.00 plus interest at the rate of 8% from August 8, 2005. He sued the defendant in Bedford, Ohio Municipal Court and obtained a verdict for defendant. The basis of his complaint is that the trial court erred granting a judgment to defendant as did the Ohio Eighth District Appellate Court and the Ohio Supreme Court in their decisions. Plaintiff raised seven federal statutes in support of this Court's jurisdiction, with the possible exception of 18 U.S.C. § 1621 pertaining to perjury, none of which apply to the facts he presented in the complaint.

While *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), the district court may dismiss an action *sua sponte* if the complaint is so "implausible, attenuated, unsubstantial, frivolous, devoid of merit, or no longer open to discussion" as to deprive the court of jurisdiction. *Apple v. Glenn*, 183 F.3d 477, 479 (6th Cir. 1999)(citing *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974)). For the following reasons, the Court finds the claim asserted in this action satisfies these criterion.

Plaintiff is complaining about an unfavorable state court decision. United States District Courts do not have jurisdiction over challenges to state court decisions even if those challenges allege that the state court's action was unconstitutional. *See District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 483 n. 16 (1983); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923). Federal appellate review of state court judgments can only occur in the United States Supreme Court, by appeal or by writ of certiorari. *Id.* Under this principle, generally referred to as the Rooker-Feldman Doctrine, a party losing his case in state court is barred from seeking what in substance would be appellate review of the state judgment in a United States District Court based on the party's claim that the state judgment itself violates his or her federal rights. *Johnson v. DeGrandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1005-06 (1994). Federal jurisdiction cannot be invoked merely by couching the claims in terms of a civil rights action. *Lavrack v. City of Oak Park*, 1999 WL 801562 \* 2 (6th Cir. Sept. 28, 1999); *see also, Valenti v. Mitchell*, 962 F.2d 288, 296 (3d Cir.1992).

The United States Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has applied two elements to a Rooker-Feldman analysis. First, in order for the Rooker-Feldman doctrine to apply to a claim presented in federal district court, the issue before the court must be inextricably intertwined with the claim asserted in the state court proceeding. *Catz v. Chalker*, 142 F.3d 279, 293 (6th Cir. 1998); *see Tropf v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co.*, 289 F.3d 929, 937 (6th Cir. 2002). "Where federal relief can only be predicated upon a conviction that the state court was wrong, it is difficult to conceive the federal proceeding as, in substance, anything other than a prohibited appeal of the state court judgment." *Catz*, 142 F.3d at 293. The Rooker-Feldman doctrine applies when the party losing his case in state court files suit in federal district court seeking redress for an injury allegedly caused by the state court's decision itself. *Coles v. Granville*, 448 F.3d 853, 857-59 (6th Cir. 2006).

Second, the Rooker-Feldman doctrine precludes a district court's jurisdiction where the claim is a specific grievance that the law was invalidly or unconstitutionally applied in plaintiff's particular case as opposed to a general constitutional challenge to the state law applied in the state action. *Id.*; *Tropf*, 289 F.3d at 937.

Since a federal court has no jurisdiction over challenges to state court decisions, it follows that a plaintiff in federal court case cannot recover damages from a defendant allegedly involved in the state court decision.

Accordingly, plaintiff's Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis is granted. This action is dismissed. The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: February 5, 2010

**S/Christopher A. Boyko**  
JUDGE CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE